Building the Knowledge School

R David Lankes
University of South Carolina

R David Lankes, "Building the Knowledge School" (2016). *Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference.*
http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284316495

Building the Knowledge School

R. David Lankes, Director, School of Library & Information Science, University of South Carolina

R. David Lankes: Thank you. Alright. This, by the way (referring to slide that says "In Search of Geeks with Social Skills"), is our marketing campaign for our undergraduate program. If you know potentially people that are not geeks but still have social skills, we have waivers available to them. There is a sort of a story that goes with this if you will excuse me introducing it. This came from one of our alumni. We've been talking about what is the knowledge school and where we're going in our school, and we've been talking with our alumni, and going through what should be, and where it is, etc. And the fellow said, "Well, what you're really looking for is geeks with social skills." And I said "Yes, that's it! That's amazing! Absolutely!" And as you'll see in a moment, we have a beautiful building on the University of South Carolina campus. It is sort of not technically on the horseshoe, but it's close enough that we pretend it's on the horseshoe, and it's got these massive columns, 20-feet high columns, and I thought, "We're going to put this on the columns!" So, I showed it to a few people, and they said, "Oh, that'd be great," and I showed my Provost, and he said, "Oh, that's really kind of funny." Then they said, "But, could you just run it by the engineers?" I said "Sure," so the Associate Dean for Engineering said "Oh, fine, marketing. We don't care. It's yours." And the folks in Computer Science said, "Eeeeh, it's fine." But, the Dean said, "We will go to the Provost and will have a debate about the word 'geek.'" I'm like, "Seriously?" And so, it is now become a benchmark that if you find this an attractive slogan, you should come into our school, and if you find this offensive, you can go into engineering. I think they were more used to being called this in a derogatory way. That's not what we're about.

Hi, my name is David Lankes, and I would like to welcome you to my newly adopted state. I've been a citizen of South Carolina now for four months. I moved from Syracuse, New York, to the University of South Carolina where I am the Director of the School for Library and Information Science. And if you're wondering why I made that move, perhaps you could spend a little bit more time outside. Though people ask, "Are you adjusting? Is it what you expected?" I did not expect to come in August and have 10 days of straight 100-degree-plus weather with the necessary humidity to go forward. I didn't expect a tropical storm. I didn't expect a hurricane. I didn't expect my Dean to step down at the same year, but other than that, yeah, it's going really well. But, we've been talking, and I realized as I was preparing this talk and the organizers were kind enough to give me a slot, that this is my third speaking engagement at Charleston, and so I realize that I've done a trilogy now, and I've realized sort of on a personal journey that each of these presentations has come at a very instrumental time in my thinking and in my career in such, and this one is no different.

In 2006, I came and talked about massive scale librarianship, and the idea was, as we heard this morning over and over and over again, it turns out we as human beings are really good at producing information and really lousy at capturing it all. And so, I like to think that I started that conversation in 2006 when it was probably 4,000 years ago when someone said, "Could you give it up with the scrolls? We've got enough!" What I realized at that time, that was a sort of realization as we were thinking about librarianship, and we were thinking about collections and were thinking about materials and acquisitions and roles with publishers, about really this notion of a hybrid collection, that we had to acknowledge and understand that ultimately our collections weren't what we licensed, weren't what we owned and purchased, but in essence they were software and all the things once again we've heard this morning. And that's evolved to really the collections and what we are preparing librarians and information professionals to deal with is that the true collection of any library is the community itself. The books, the materials, the databases, the emulation software, the archives, all of these are tools, and tools to help develop that community and move that community forward, but that knowledge, and this is one thing that I did my best, I sat really, literally in the back of the room today and tried not to jump up every time, although the people sitting next to me did notice a few of these (pretending to twitch) every time they talked about knowledge as something that you could put in a binder and put on a shelf. Because if you think about it for a moment, those are materials, those are interesting things, but knowledge is uniquely what is in our head.

https://doi.org/10.5703/1288284316495

If I give you a book and it's written in Chinese, and you don't speak Chinese, can we truly call it knowledge? We can call it "capability of knowledge." You can call it sort of "latent knowledge." It's waiting for engagement, but it isn't until we take it up within the community and try to apply it to our context and our situation that it becomes knowledge. And this became very, very clear to me recently, and for those of you who have just come from the plenary session, the slain librarian is my alumni. She came from my program. We have recently—she hosted co-ops for people up the street, and what I have heard from people that have worked for her, who have learned from her, who she was a mentor to, they have said the first thing she would do is she would put us in a car and drive us around the community. The first thing she would do is she would go out to where the communities are, where they couldn't necessarily get to the library, and her message was always, "This is your library. This is the community." That knowledge is what that community needs to move ahead, what that community needs to advance. That knowledge is not a cold thing is. It is not a documented thing. It is not something that sits on a shelf or repository or an archive. It is passion. It is light. It is understanding, and it is an intensely human thing. The issues of how we capture data, how we capture materials: Vital, important, absolutely. Core to what we do, but let us never mistake that what we are collecting them for is not for the sake of collection, and while I love the concept that we are in the business of eternity, we have an obligation to those in the present to figure out how to help them improve their life.

So, that was 2006, and we called it "Participatory Librarianship." And then in 2009, they brought me back, and I talked about new librarianship and in it, this was, I looked it up, this was the first time that I sort of publicly put out this concept that the mission of librarians is to improve society through facilitating knowledge creation in their communities. That has since become something that has turned into the *Atlas of New Librarianship* and additional books, and actually it was with my same moderator who then looked at me and asked the first question after it, and he said, "As a publisher, that is my mission." And I've had teachers say, "That is my mission." And I've had lots of people, academics say, "That is my mission." Google could say, "That is my mission," and I have to say when he asked that question, I gulped a little and then thought a lot later, and I said, you know, that's good. Having an open mission like that means we have allies, and it means that we have people that we can work together. So, that began a whole different thinking, and now in 2016, I am back because really this is the next step in this evolution.

The first step is it's more than just stuff. It's communities. Its people. Its knowledge. It's human. It's understanding these things. The second was our role as librarians is we must facilitate this, be part of this, and help it push forward. We must work with publishers and data and scientists and our communities as a collection, and we must figure out how to help communities make better decisions, how to learn. And now, I'm here to say it is my turn to start talking about how we push that forward in a very specific way. We all have things that we can do, and one of the things that I am now very essentially concerned about, and my faculty are very essentially concerned about, and my staff are essentially concerned is what role does a library school or a library and information school play in this ecosystem? What does it look like to prepare librarians today? In times of radical change and in times of the mutating library, how we prepare people for this? How do we come out, and how do we deal with the fact that we are now generating people who walk around and say, "I'm an information professional," and everyone looks and goes, ". . . and an information professional is . . . ?" That geeks with social skills came because we have a Bachelor of Science and information science. Can I just tell you how excited 18-year-olds get by saying, "I'm going to be an information scientist." Can I tell you how excited their parents are when they ask, "And what's that job title look like?" And we're like, "Eeehhh . . ." But they can be librarians, and can I tell you the rare unicorn who is an 18-year-old that says, "I've always known I want to be a librarian, and I'm going to start now even though when I get the bachelor's degree it doesn't count." These are the things that we are wrestling with. So, what I'd like to do is I'd like to talk about how we see and envision building this knowledge school and really as a way to begin a conversation.

So, with that, I want to give you a little history because one could say, "We already know how to do this, Dave. Come on, we have library and information schools. We have iSchools!" Many of you are probably graduates of or related to or, as case may be, you're graduates of a library school that is now an information school, and do you know why and are you happy with that? Did they change the name? And

all these things. So, we could simply say "Let's see where we bend," because clearly this is the blueprint. We can see in 1988 we talked about the "Gang of Three," and the "Gang of Three" was Syracuse, Pittsburgh, and Drexel. We all hung out together at ACES Conferences, and we all gave each other high fives at how advanced we were, and it was really cool and we were better than the other kids, and frankly, it was all an evil scheme to overthrow the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Illinois because those bastards owned the rankings, and we to this day are waiting for their alumni to die out. So, good. Now, see, we are loosening up?

This turned into, by the 1990s, we had two years to work on it, and we added a person. It was Rutgers that said, "No, no, we too! We, too! We can do communications!" And that's cool. So, Rutgers began playing, and we were fine because we had places to stay when we visited New York City. Then by 2001, it took 11 years, and we added one more person, we were working hard, and so now Washington. Now, why Washington? My adviser, Mike Eisenberg, who I love dearly, quit, took the job at University of Washington, and he used to call it, and I'm going to remind him of this every time I see it, that University of Washington was the "Syracuse West" program. He doesn't say that anymore, but we began to expand and think about this. Right? We began looking at schools moving from schools of librarianship to schools of library, and information science to iSchools to schools of information, etc. Then the "Gang of 10." I don't know why it was the same year, but apparently they were really quick this time, we brought in Michigan and Florida State and UNC. Now we have the "iSchool Caucus" that started in 2008 where we have a ton of schools that identify themselves as iSchools. So, this is a sort of chronology, and we can say, "Well, this is easy, Dave. You're South Carolina. You write them a check. You become the iSchool caucus, and you're an iSchool." And we know what that means. That means go get more research funding, build a big undergraduate program, do lots of flashy things. We've already put a big TV in our hallway; it's exciting.

We can also look at this evolution from a structural standpoint, as a topical standpoint. This is my take, a very unscientific take, of the evolution of where we began as library science. If you look at sort of the iSchool movement, it began as library schools that begin thinking differently. Back in the mid-70s, Robert Taylor, when he became the Dean of Syracuse University, renamed it from the School of Librarianship to the School of Information Studies. By the way, why "studies" and not "science"? Because everyone admitted we had no idea what it meant, and science sounded too pretentious. And that's why, by the way, I have a PhD in Information Transfer. I told this to one of my college buddies who instantly said. "So you're getting a PhD in being a bike messenger?" I said, "Yeah, pretty much." And information library science, we sort of knew what it was, it was cataloging and materials, and, yes, we could talk about collection size, and we could talk about different schemas for organization. And that really then grew into this notion of Information Studies, which was happening outside of libraries, and we saw more and more organizations looking at information as a strategic asset. We saw it in the corporate sector. We saw an explosion in the government sector around information resource management, if those of you lived back in those times. We saw the advent of information CIOs, and so that happened. We saw that library science grabbed technology very early on and very aggressively. An outgrowth of that became information retrieval. It brought computer scientists and librarians together. We had lots of data. They had lots of time. It worked out. Luckily, we found people with lots of funding. So, information retrieval became core, and what we begin to see as information retrieval has been advanced to the larger concept of information technology computing, human-computer interaction. Information studies became a strong emphasis on management and increased in their own communications. We see this sort of broadening of the conversation of the topics.

Now, what's also interesting is that I'm going to give you one more set of evolutions that's on this rough timeline. Really, when we were talking about this in library science land in early times, the focus was on professional preparation. What do librarians need to know? What is an information professional? What are their core skills? That led to the Golden Age. The Internet, we have a moment where we say, "Boy, that's really changed our lives now!" But you have never seen more red meat put in front of hungry dogs than when the Internet hit the information schools. Suddenly, it was all about experimentation. It was all about what can we do with computers? What can we do with technology? We can totally change health care. We can totally change libraries. We can totally change this. And everything was put in front of digital. Right? We had this acronym of

virtual and digital, and it became virtual libraries, virtual reference. I was there. Don't blame me. Well, blame me. Digital libraries, etc., and everything was new and cool, and it was an amazing sense of expectation. And it grew very much in this "Gang of Five" era to a sense of social change. There was a real sense that we could use technology, that this new larger concept of information could talk about societal change. And we're going to come back to that, but at this time, it's worth noting that it was almost always from the perspective of sort of technological determinism, that is society would change of course in a positive way because applying technology always has a positive effect.

How many of you have ever bitten your tongue when you've heard that person say, "I am going to solve world hunger. I've written an app." And you're like, unless they could eat the damn phone, you have not solved world hunger, but that is really where we were. I was, I am not making this up, I was the coordinator of a virtual reality laboratory in 1989. I can tell you that I could take the press releases and the garbage I wrote then, and put it out now and just put "Samsung" on the top of it, and it would be the same stuff: This concept that things were going to fundamentally change, and it was always going to be for the better. What we see now, particularly among the iSchools, is a much different conversation and its institutionalization. Part of it is a respect thing. How do we get people to respect us? Are we a field unto ourselves? Do we have to look at the historians and say, "Look, we have theory, too?" But a lot of it is how do we build in support? How many faculty do we need? What is the faculty-to-student ratio that makes sense? How do we staff that? How do we support it? So, there are a lot of discussions about what is an iSchool and a lot of discussions about information, but I would argue that there is also a lot of caution that I have perceived, primarily from the library community, but also on my own. And that is a growing "L" versus "I" breach. That this also goes in cycles, and it began with the "L" word. "Oh, no; you are no longer a School of Library Science." By the way, I would like to officially make an announcement today that our school will not be changing its name. But, that idea of when Syracuse, when Illinois, when Rutgers, when they dropped that "L" word, did they devalue our profession? Are they not paying attention to us? Are they moving to these undergraduate populations because they are shinier? The alumni are going to make more money? Or, "Oh, it's great because now they can work for IBM." And now you're bringing in people who worked for IBM and have never been in a library. Is that okay or is that not okay?

We've had this argument on a regular basis. Michael Gorman got up and berated the ACE's crowd during a keynote once, and he said, "You're missing out. We've done this all in library science! It's called cataloging. Get on board!" And many of us went, "He doesn't get it." And he didn't on that, but he got a lot of stuff right. And so what we're seeing now is that when we talk about libraries, and we talk about the curriculum, and we talk about what we prepare, we talk about skills. We are teaching them cataloging, RDA. We're teaching them all these wonderful things, and we talk about values. Our values of privacy, our values of diversity, our values of intellectual access—all of these things. And we talk about service. We're all about service. We are servicers. And we talk about members. By the way, the other twitch I did was every time I heard the word "user." How many people think about that you serve your users well? How many people enjoy being used? Think about that. When you conceptualize, talk about, and relate people as users, what you are saying is you are putting yourself in a position where you are used, and they are using you. And that might be okay, but don't ever talk to me about consumers. Because on the information side, what do we see? We see it is all about technology. We can do this with technology. We have these ubiquitous networks, right? We see that instead of values there is sort of a social science perspective that is that it is value-less. That we go to a community, and we understand what they are doing, and we have objective measures, and we bring qualitative methodologies to it. But there is an antiseptic nature to the approaches around social science sometimes that doesn't come from anthropology and sociology, but comes very much from this concept of when we move from the humanities view of libraries to the social science perspective and technical perspective. We begin to address this concept of objectivity, and it became problematic. A focus instead of on service on products. What is the next app? What is the next solution? What is the next brand? And once again talking about users: User experience, user-based design, user, user, user. And I'm going to argue that what we need to do is put these back together. That neither of these are wrong, and, in fact, the librarians and the information professionals need each other because this should be a unified set of skills and understanding, not separated.

And so how do we put that together? And that's what I want to begin talking about in this concept that we as South Carolina are calling the "Knowledge School." And there are three components that I want to talk to you today about this Knowledge School concept. The first is how we move from a school to a school of thought. How we move, and how we must be focused on participation and impact. And how we need a unified mission but diverse in how it is implemented in our communities and the delivery method. So, let's begin here by talking about moving from a school to a school of thought. What is it that holds the school? Think about for a moment your alum, your alma mater, whether it was South Carolina, whether it was Syracuse, Emporia, whatever it was. I don't care. What is it that has made the community better by them being there? What held them together? Why did those professors with those disciplines sit together? Now, sometimes the answer is because they were thrown there. Sometimes it just evolved that way. Sometimes it was opportunistic. The question becomes why are we together now? One of my faculty members, fabulous faculty member, Jennifer Arns, is in the audience. Why is Jennifer sitting next to me? And why does Jennifer, whose great work in the area of public policy and impact of public libraries, why did she sit across the hallway from someone who's doing data mining and looking at Twitter feeds? And why does she sit upstairs from someone who is working in school libraries and basic literacy? And why are they sitting next to someone who is working on information within religious communities? Why are we together? And the short answer can't be because we are preparing librarians. Because we know that our alums, yes, some become librarians, but they also work for Google, and they also work for Springer, and they also work in lots of different places. And our undergraduates, some of them don't work in libraries either. Why are we together? And that must come from the school of thought. What I'm going to argue is, rather than saying it's because that's where our vita was, or that was our history, we must do it because we are all trying to solve a common problem. So, as we begin to think of it, what is the common problem that holds us all together as library and information science?

I'm not the only one to ask this. We brought together a group of people: Andrew Dillon, Sam Hastings, Tula Giannini from Pratt, Anne Craig, Annie Norman, a bunch of people. We said, "What is the grand challenge of library and information science? What is it that we are trying to solve?" Bill Arms, who was at Cornell, had a great thought experiment. He said, "You are the new president of your University, and you've asked every school to send you their star, that is someone who is highly recognized and is highly influential and is recognized by other people." So, the math department sends someone who got the whatever prize, and the business sends the guy who got the Nobel Prize in economics, right? And all of these awards show up. What does the school of library and information science's star look like? What problem did they solve that was so fundamental that they made an impression, and that impact is also recognized by all the other people sitting around? What is it that we do that physicists go, "Thank God you're here?" What is it that we do that philosophers and historians say, "That was a really good job you did." And so that is the notion of a grand challenge. Now what's interesting about a grand challenge is it's not about us. A lot of the dialogue that we see around the future of library, and that we see in the iSchool movements, and we see and hear all the time are why are we sitting together? And it's very introverted. What we need to talk about is: What is the problem in a community that we can provide the solution for? What is it that we have solved that our communities need? And so this group conceptualized, and they said what we live in a knowledge society. By the way, this gets really practical at the end, I promise. Stick with me. The knowledge society is the fact that we don't live in an information society. We've grown past that. It's not a matter of access to bits and data and stuff. It's access to intelligence and good decision-making, right? It's not about how much we can push at people but how much they can make sense of the things that they need, right? Our problem in this presidential election is not that we have too little to read. It's the fact that there is so much to read that you can pick what you want and that when you read that there is a lot of heat and very little light.

So, how do we bring that together? And understanding that in this knowledge society, one of the fundamental differences between this view of the current world and the world of 10 years ago, frankly, the world that we heard in our opening plenaries when we talked about what the users want. Do we believe that there is a single unified concept of "user" that we can all serve? And by the way, back to "used." Do we want to talk about the people that we can give things to, or do we want to talk about partners and

communities and members and such? And understand that the diversity that we work at means that, yes, we should look at unified economies of scale, but ultimately our abilities to match very local needs. And so what is big and different in this world is that we now have to accept that there are multiple ways of coming to a solution or the truth. How do we function in a world that truly believes there are multiple ways of arriving at the truth and that those truths can be very different? How do we function? Is our job to fix it? Is our job to ignore it? How do we deal with this? How do we deal with the fact that we can look at data and walk away and say, "That is bogus. It's rigged. It's fixed." How do we deal with that? In this knowledge society, we have a functioning knowledge economy. That is, how do we then work? How do we develop and distribute our resources? The input to this economy is through innovation, progress, and a workforce; the people who we are preparing to go out and work. The 3-year-olds, the 10-year-olds, the 60-year-olds that are constantly having to figure out—how do we divide these resources and the knowledge economy takes these resources and decides how we distribute it? How we define the community, and how we are constantly learning in this environment? That is the society that we are functioning in. The grand challenge is how, based on that economy, it functions on an infrastructure just like we talk about market economy and transportation economy, right? Getting goods from one place to another needs our roads, our infrastructure, getting ideas and thoughts and understanding and learning from one place to another needs an infrastructure. And that infrastructure consists of technology, and that's the obvious part. That's the pretty part, but it very much consists of sources. That's where a lot of the focus of this conference and folks are in, the things we use to make decisions, the materials, the resources, the reports, the data. It also involves permissions, that is, who can get to those resources, open access, copyright, right? Fee for pay, all of these things. And finally, the people—the people that are making the decisions.

When we look at this knowledge infrastructure, we have questions. We note that this current knowledge infrastructure is currently uncoordinated and conflicted. That is, there is a lot of people doing a lot of stuff, but no one is talking to each other. I very much appreciate the phrase "information policy wars." That is not too much of a metaphor. We have conflicts between people who want to make money and people who do access. We at this conference represent the amazing conflict. We have people who are trying to sell us stuff, while other people are trying to give it away, and we are all trying to get together and figure out we can still be happy about that. So, a little conflict is always going to be there, but uncoordinated makes it problematic. If you have ever traveled overseas and you've ever tried to get a SIM card, you know how problematic it can be. I was over in the U.K. I was in London, and I went into a Three store. I said I would like a SIM card. And five minutes later, five minutes later, I walked out for 30 pounds with unlimited data and unlimited international calling, and it worked in my phone, and I could walk out. If I walked into a Verizon or AT&T store, three hours later I would be pissed off, thought that I had been ripped off, have a phone that doesn't work, and by the way the SIM will come next week and, etc. So, conflict, not always good. This market economy thing needs some thinking. We know that there are challenges to conceptualize and form this infrastructure. We heard that today. We talk about knowledge as if it were a thing, and we talk about that thing as if it's a book. I mean, call it whatever you want, journal article, whatever. We think that it's a well-heeled, well-understood, well-synthesized piece in front of us, and that's not what it is. For example, if you drove here today, there's an excellent chance you generated about a gig of data in some computer somewhere. You generated it because you used a GPS system. Maybe you listened to music online, or you had an intelligence management system telling you where. Is that part of the infrastructure? And you sit there and say, "Well, does that matter?" And I say, "Well, if you're in the information infrastructure business, are you in the road business?" Remember the days when we were arguing whether the Internet was part of our collection? Now are going to talk about is the highway part of my collection? And you sit there and go, "Absolutely not!" But talk to a transportation librarian. Number one use of tolled data, our FID tolled data at New York State, is tolling, duh. Number two: Divorce lawyers. If someone walks into your library and says, "I need to find out where this person was last Thursday." You actually might need to be going and querying not a database but a piece of asphalt. How do we prepare people for that skill?

This will always be a marketplace of public and private. We need to talk about how we move from the consumption-production dichotomy to participation. If we are constantly preparing librarians and information professionals to be used and users, consumers and producers, we are setting

up a generation of dependent and independent people in society. If what we're talking about is, we take materials to underserved populations, poor kids in rural South Carolina, and we give them books, but we don't inspire them to write their own, we are creating and furthering dependence on a system, not liberating and challenging the norm. Because you have writers, and you have readers. A famous illustrator said I used to go into kindergarten and ask, "How many people of you are artists?" And they all raised their hands. "How many people are writers?" They all raised their hands. He says I go into a third-grade classroom and ask the same question. No hands go up because they've been trained that they read. They have been trained that they watch, not that they produce; not that they make, but that they consume. We need to take on an infrastructure that allows not simply quick, fast, and interesting access to other people's stuff. If we constantly argue about how do we build an open access model that simply allows people to consume things for free, and we don't realize it is the "consume" part that is much more problematic than the "free" part, or at least as, we miss the boat. And many of us come from academia where we sort of assume people are producers. That is what our faculty are like all the time. But look at the assignments that we give to our undergraduates and our graduate students where they're showing up, and they're taking and copying and pasting the abstract, hoping to God that they don't put into turnitin.com and seeing they got the "A." That's not what we should be supporting.

So, our ultimate grand challenge that we need to solve is how do we coordinate a knowledge infrastructure to speed learning and improve the decision-making of our communities, right? That's what we want to do. That person who shows up to the president's office, their goal is not to say, "Boy, I figured out BIBFRAME last night." Their goal is to say I helped your university, by the way, be 28% more productive, increase the GDP by this amount, help our students become these things. Our goal, our result, our grand theme is talking about a society that has truly open access to ideas where they move, and they understand, and they learn. Where we can bring the Trump supporter and the Clinton supporter together, and we can say, "Look you may not agree, but let us at least agree on what we're going to discuss and what we are going to accept." In this world, what then becomes the research agenda of a knowledge school, of mar researchers, what do I look at? Why is Jennifer next to these folks? Lifelong learning. We need the people who are speeding decision-making. We need to understand how they learn. People don't read. They learn through reading. People don't talk. They learn through talking. They're constantly learning and adjusting their environment. We have to be aware and understand how lifelong learning. Why are our school librarians here? Because they are instrumental in understanding how we teach information literacy at the higher ed level and the community level and the special level.

The science of facilitation. We used to think that we could automate everything, but now we know that people who can afford it get people to do it. How do we facilitate this? How do we bring that conversation together? How do we bring communities in a land of multiple ways of the truth to still be a community? And so we talk about the idea of public policy. We talk about the idea of access for people with disabilities. Community: How do we bring communities together to do resources and finally moving from consumers to participants? This is an agenda of a knowledge school, and, yes, they're going to look very differently. Someone is going to work in a classroom on basic literacy, etc., but it fits together. So, we move to a school of thought that conceptualizes our job as to improve the knowledge infrastructure and libraries and in business and in government and in not-for-profits. And then we need to say why do we do it? Because we are focused on practice and impact. Two images (referring to a slide): The one on the left is Cocky's Reading Express, and that is Cocky. I am now a proud Gamecock. Thank you very much. And Cocky's Reading Express, that is our school mascot. What happened is Sam Hastings and Kim Jeffcoat and the faculty of the school got together and said, "We have a problem. In rural South Carolina, we have a literacy problem. We need to solve it." And so what they did is they bought a bus. They got a bunch of books, and they got Cocky, and they brought athletes and football players and undergraduates from across the discipline, and they drive them to Union. They drive them to Calhoun County. They get off there, and people show up. They're excited. They give them pizza, and they give them a new book. And that connects them to self-worth, and it begins to talk about literacy, and they demonstrate that reading is important. Even if you want to be a football player, you got to read. Because we know that if you are not reading at grade level by third

grade, your ability to succeed in high school and the percentage of people who are going to drop out of school goes way up. We got to start early. The other picture is Columbia. I've actually been on that corner. Just about a year and a half ago, our 1,000-year flood. What happened when FEMA showed up is, they showed up, and they showed up in public libraries because they were community centers. That is where they could begin talking. And our faculty went out and said, "Okay, how do we deal with people with disabilities? When you talk about evacuating people from the coast, were they accessible? How do we deal with health information?" That is, did you know that water is full of sewage, and this is what you need to worry about in terms of health information? I had a great story of someone in this past hurricane of someone who couldn't leave their house, not because it was flooded, but because the yard around it was flooded, and it had water moccasins flying around in it! Dear God, I live here now! The point being it's not just about doing good research and sitting back, documenting and publishing. It's doing. If we know that literacy works this way, get out and help people be literate! If we know that disaster relief should work that way, get out there and help in disaster relief! During the evacuation from Hurricane Matthew, a number of my faculty and staff opened up their house to strangers during the evacuation. That I consider part of being part of my school. That is commendable and rewardable service, that it is part and integrated into the access of impact.

Finally, we must talk about a unified mission but in diverse ways of talking about it. So, we have a thought. We're going to fix the information infrastructure. We're going to facilitate it and help people learn. We're going to do it by actually doing things. We're going to study. We're going to write, and we are going to think, but we have to actually go out and make it happen. Your internships that you did as MLS students, first part, but did your faculty sit right next to you on that internship because they were learning as well? Did they create those opportunities?

Now we need to talk about a unified mission but diverse implementation. What do I mean by unified mission? So, South Carolina does something really great. Do I have anyone here who happens to be from Kansas or Washington State? We're sorry about Boeing. We have a lot of high-tech manufacturing moving into South Carolina for lots of reasons, but what they're finding is when they go to hire people, they don't have a workforce that is ready for them. So, what they start doing is, they start investing in high school STEM education, and they find out that it's too late. That you can't teach people in computer-aided manufacturing. You can't teach people in high-tech basic engineering physics if they can't read. And so now we're realizing they have to go back, and they have to work at the third look great level with basic literacy interventions and things of that nature. Each community is going to have different barriers. Maybe that is literacy as it is for Boeing. Maybe it is STEM/Sciences. Maybe it is health information, social services. What does your community need? So, it is not a generic view. And that diversity of ideas, of community needs, must have a match with diversity of faculty and students and professions from those communities. And we need to look at different ways of delivering that information as well. Graduate programs, yes, undergraduates: Why do we have an undergraduate program? I was asked this. It's not to make little librarians, and it's not to ignore libraries and get the people with the big alumni focus. If I want librarians to survive, and I want librarians to survive, and I want them to thrive, I need to not only prepare the librarians, I need to prepare the mayors, the CIOs, the board members, the Provost, the faculty that are going to hire and support them. Why do I have an undergraduate program? Because I want a generational view to improve librarianship, and it's not going to happen alone. I need people in industry. I need people in education. I need people in social service, and they're going to get there through an undergraduate degree. And then, yes, a master's degree and maybe a doctoral degree, but we need that support. That is the unifying vision, and we need to break out of a three-credit model. That is another three hours. I know I'm over time already, so I will just and on this.

When Bob Taylor in the 70s showed up at Syracuse, he said, "I know information is important and increasingly important outside of libraries, and I'm going to make a bargain with librarians. If you go with me, if you support us going to Library and Information Science, if you support a master's program, if you support technology and learning about technology, it will benefit libraries." And I think at this point we actually have some success in this. We have libraries that are better enabled to participate in technology. DPLA would not have existed had we not brought information technology as part of librarianship. We

have values. We have ethics. We have lots of librarians out there. We have them working in different industries, and we get the attention of people like Google. Google comes and recruits from our staff. We have doctoral students going. That promise is made. What is the next promise? The next promise that I want to make, that I want us to be a part of, to get feedback and discussion as alumni and aspirational alumni and whatever, the next promise is: If we go beyond informing and information, if we go beyond a static view of simply providing big pipes to free information, if we move beyond consumers, if we move to truly participation, knowledge, learning, social action, and social engagement, we will improve the status of librarians in libraries, outside of libraries, and by doing so, we will improve the society itself. And so, what I ask of you is, while you might already have your degree, send me your poor, your in need of status, your 18-year-olds lost, but send me your ideas and thoughts. Let us truly figure out how we can use our social skills and our unique capabilities of librarians to improve the society that we are a part of and how we educate and prepare and marshal troops of librarians and information professionals to make that happen. Thank you very much.